In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

48

PĀŚUPATA AND SĀṂKHYA - YOGA

By

MINORU HARA, *Tokyo*

I

Several passages of Classical Sanskrit Literature enumerate the Pāśupata together with Sāṃkhya and Yoga as the prevalent schools of thought (*jñāna*)[1]:

1. *Mahābhārata* 12. 337. 59 (Poona Edition). :

sāṃkhyam yogaḥ pañcarātraṃ vedāḥ pāśupataṃ tathā ।
jñānāny etāni rājarṣe viddhi nānā-matāni vai ॥

Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa :

sāṃkhyaṃ yogaṃ pañcarātraṃ śaivaṃ pāśupatam tathā ।
kṛtānta-pañcakaṃ viddhi brahmaṇaḥ parimārgaṇe ॥ (1. 74. 34)
sāṃkhya-yogaḥ pañcarātraṃ vedāḥ pāśupataṃ tathā ।
kṛtānta-pañcakaṃ hy etac chāstrāṇi vividhāni ca ॥ (2. 22. 133-134)
saṃkarṣaṇaḥ pañcarātram rudraḥ pāśupataṃ tathā ।
pātañjalam anantaś ca sāṃkhyaṃ ca kapilo muniḥ ॥ (3. 73. 48)

(Cf. R. C. Hazra, "The Viṣṇudharmottara, an Encyclopaedic Work of the Gupta Period (400-500 A.D.), '*Journal of the University of Gauhati*, Vol. 3, 1952, pp. 39-64, and K. K. Bhattacarya, *Les religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge* (Paris, 1960) p. 43.

Agni Purāṇa 219. 61. :

sāṃkhyaṃ yogaḥ pāśupatam vedā vai pañcarātrakam ।
kṛtāntapañcakaṃ hy etad gāyatrī ca śivā tathā ॥

Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā 11. 57-64. :

tatakṣa bhagavān pūrvam apāntar atapā muniḥ ॥ (57)
harer vācyayānaḥ putro yāvad āttaṃ ca vai tataḥ ।
udabhūt tatra dhī-rūpam ṛg-yajuḥ-sāma-saṁkulam ॥ (58)
viṣṇu-saṃkalpa-sambhūtam etad vācyayāneritam ।
tatakṣa kapilaḥ śāstrād yāvad aṃśam udāra-dhīḥ ॥ (59)
tat sāṃkhyaṃ bhagavat-chāstram prasamkhyāna-parāyaṇam ।
hiraṇya-garbho lokādir yat tatakṣādi-śāsanāt ॥ (60)
yamādy-aṅgam abhūd etad divyam yogānuśāsanam ।
ahaṃ tatakṣa yac chāstrād aṃśān nānā-vratākulāt ॥ (61)
abhūt pāśupatākhyaṃ tat paśu-pāśa-vimocanam ।
ṣaḍ-āgama-mayāt tasmāt kevalād divya-śāsanāt ॥ (62)
nirmame sāram uddhṛtya svayaṃ viṣṇur asamkulam ।
tat para-vyūha-vibhava-svabhāvādi-nirūpaṇam ॥ (63)
pañcarātrāhvayaṃ tantram mokṣaika-phala-lakṣaṇam ।

Sārasvata Stotra as quoted by Kṣemarāja on *Stavacintāmaṇi* 16 :

yad uktaṃ sārasvate stotre—
trayī sāṃkhyaṃ yogaḥ paśupati-mataṃ vaiṣṇavam iti
prabhinne prasthāne param idam adaḥ pathyam iti ca ।
rucīnāṃ vaicitryād ṛju-kuṭila-nānā-patha-juṣām
nṛṇām eko gamyas tvam asi payasām arṇava iva ॥

(Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 10, p. 26, lines 4-7)

Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā 12. 1 :

trayī sāṃkhyaṃ tathā yoga-śāstram pāśupataṃ tathā ।
sāttvataṃ ceti tad rūpaṃ stotum icchāmy aham prabho ॥

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

According to another group of passages, the followers of the Pāśupata seem to have shared a fate with those of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga in being condemned by the orthodox philosophers as heretics[2], criticized by Buddhists as holding wrong views[3] and excluded from society by Smṛti writers as untouchables[4]. A reader of those passages has naturally an impression that the Pāśupata school partook of the same lot together wish Sāṃkhya and Yoga for better or for worse.

In addition to this external textual evidence we have internal evidence within the Pāśupata writings. Kauṇḍinya, the commentator of the P (āśupata) S (ūtra) who may have lived about the fifth or sixth centuries, took advantage of the Sāṃkhya philosophy for the formation of his own doctrine[5]. Moreover, the famous three-fold classification of suffering (*duḥkha*), which is first mentioned in *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, is repeatedly met with in the Pāśupata writings[6].

---

2. Kumārila's *Tantravārttika*, (Banares Sanskrit Series 25, p. 114, lines 22 ff.)
trayī-viparītāsambaddha-dṛṣṭa-śobhādi-pratyakṣānumānopamānārthāpatti-prāyayukti-mūlopanibaddhāni sāṃkhya-yoga-pāñcarātra-pāśupata-śākya-nirgrantha-parigṛhīta-dharmādharma-nibandhanāni |

3. *Sagātaka* of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, (B. Nanjio Ed. p. 342). (10. 627)
sāṃkhyā vaiśeṣikā nagnā viprāḥ pāśupatās tathā |
asad-sad-dṛṣṭi-patitā viviktārtha-vivarjitāḥ ||

4. *Smṛti-candrikā* (Government Oriental Library Series, Mysore 44, p. 310)
bauddhān pāśupatān jaiñān lokāyatika-kāpilān |
vikarmasthān dvijān spṛṣṭvā sucelo jalam āviśet ||
kāpālikāṃs tu saṃspṛśya prāṇāyāmo 'dhiko mataḥ |

(Cf. R. C. Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, Dacca, 1940, p. 201 and P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Part 2, Poona 19, p. 169).

5. Cf. for example, J. Gonda, *Die Religionen Indiens* (Stuttgart, 1963), p. 214, "*Kaundinya, der der erste Pāṣupata gewesen sein dürfte, der seine bis dahin sich in Werk und "Meditation" erschopfende Religion zu einem philosophisch fundierten System entwickelte und dabei mit bewunderungswurdiger Konsequenz die ursprünglich grössenteils atheistischen Philosopheme anderer Schulen zum Aufbau seines realistischen Monotheismus einsetzte stutzte sich dabei hauptsächlich auf Sāṃkhya, Yoga und Vaiśeṣika.*"

6. *Kim eteṣām ādhyātmikādhibhautikādhidaivikānām sarva-duḥkhānām aikāntiko'tyantiko vyapoho'sty uta neti* (p. 4, lines 8-10) | *ihādhyātmikādhibhautikādhidaivikānāṃ sarva-dvan-dvādvandvānāṃ manasi śarīre ca upanipatitānāṃ sahiṣṇutvam apratīkāraś ceti yasmāt kṛto* ('*to*)' *trākrodhaḥ tantre siddhaḥ* (p. 25, lines 8-10) |

nāyānty (?)*-ādhyātmikādhibhautikādhidaivikās teṣāṃ svaśāstroktena akurvatāṃ tapo niṣpadyate* (p. 69, lines 4-6) |
tayos (=go-dharma and mṛga-dharma) *tu sati dharma-bahutve samāno dharmo gṛhyate, ādhyātmikādi-dvandva-sahiṣṇutvam* (p. 121, lines 3-4) |
duḥkhānām ity atra prasiddhāni duḥkhāny ādhyātmikādhibhautikādhidaivikāni (p. 141, lines 10-13) |

tathānyad api tri-vidhaṃ duḥkhaṃ bhavati | *Ādhyātmikam ajñānam puruṣe, ādhibhautikaṃ viṣayitvam, ādhidaivikaṃ ca paśutvaṃ trividhaṃ aparam prāhuḥ* (p. 143, lines 12-13) |

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Despite this closeness which the Pāśupata held to Sāṃkhya and Yoga, the former seems to have tried to distinguish itself from the latter two. In Kauṇḍinya's work especially we notice that Sāṃkhya and Yoga are the schools of thought to which his criticism is mainly directed and against which the Pāśupata claims its superiority.

Below, we shall collect from Kauṇḍinya's *Bhāṣya* and the *Ratnaṭīkā* of Bhāsarvajña those passages in which these Pāśupata writers looked down upon Sāṃkhya and Yoga, and shall see how the concepts peculiar to Sāṃkhya and Yoga are treated in the monotheistic framework of the Pāśupata Śaivism.

II

The means (*sādhana*) to the attainment of the goal as held by Pāśupata school is distinguished from that which is taught in Sāṃkhya and Yoga. On equating *vikaraṇa* (without instruments)[7] with *kaivalya* (perfect isolation), Kauṇḍinya introduces a question.

āha—aviśeṣād iha sāṃkhya-yogādīnām api sahaiśvaryeṇa kārya-karaṇa-tyāgaṃ kṛtvā kaivalya-niṣṭhe | ihāpi ca śāstre | kathaṃ tasmād aviśeṣaḥ ? atha matiḥ niratiśaye mokṣe nāsti vaiṣamyaṃ, tathāpy atidānādibhiḥ sādhya-sādhana-niṣṭhāto 'tha viśeṣaḥ ucyate | nāviśeṣaḥ (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 143, p. 45, lines 13-16).

("The question is raised) because then there would be no difference. In other systems such as the Sāṃkhya and Yoga, etc., the state of perfect isolation (*kaivalya*) together with sovereignty (*aiśvarya*) is attained by the abandoning of effects and instruments; and just the same is taught here also in this scripture. (Answer) How does it follow from this that there is no difference? If you think that all things are the same in absolute release there is still a difference in regard to the means, viz., transcendent giving (*atidāna*), etc., by which the goal is reached. So we say there is not 'no difference'."

Granting that the goal is the same, the means of attaining the goal are different[8]. Transcendent giving (*atidāna*), transcendent sacrifice (*atiyajana*) and transcendent asceticism (*atitāpa*) are peculiar to Pāśupata Śaivism and these are totally foreign to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

---

7. PS. 1. 25 (*vikaraṇaḥ*), together with PS. 1. 23 (*manojavitvam*), should be compared with *Yoga Sūtra* 3. 48.
tato manojavitvaṃ vikaraṇa-bhāvaḥ pradhāna-jayaś ca |
Vyāsa comments on this sūtra as follows—
kāyasyānuttamo gati-lābho manojavitvam, videhānām indriyāṇām abhipreta-deśa-kāla-viṣayāpekṣo vṛtti-lābho vikaraṇa-bhāvaḥ |

8. Cf. RT. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 15) p. 22, lines 5-6.
lābhānām upāya ity etad gamyamānārtha,yāpy abhidhānaṃ śāstrāntaroktānām mokṣopāyānām anupāyatva-jñāpanārtham |
"Means of the Attainments : This express mention of what may be understood from what has already been said is for the purpose of showing that the means of (attaining) release taught in other scriptures are the wrong means."

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Now if the means are different from and transcendent to the ordinary means taught in the Sāṃkhya and Yoga, the goal which is to be attained by these means is naturally different from and transcendent to the ordinary goal. Kauṇḍinya deals with this matter by first raising questions and then by answering them.

āha-atidānādi-niṣpannena prakṛṣṭena tapasāsya brāhmaṇasya kā gatir bhavatīti ucyate-abhyudaya-kaivalya-vyatirekeṇa

ATYĀGATIṂ GAMAYATE (PS. 2. 17)

.....*sāṃkhya-yogābhyudayādi-gati-viśeṣa-viśeṣitatvād upariṣṭād vartata ity arthaḥ* (p. 69, line 15-p. 70, line 2) |

" (Question) What goal does the brahmin achieve with the extra asceticism produced by his transcendent giving, etc.?

(Answer) As distinguished from success (*abhyudaya*: Sāṃkhya) and perfection (lit. isolation, *kaivalya*: Yoga).

.....The sense is that he attains a higher goal, for it is distinguished from particular goals as the success, etc., promised by the Sāṃkhya and Yoga."

As is stated above, the goal to which the Pāśupata aspirant is led (*atigati*) is distinguished from those taught in the Sāṃkhya and Yoga, and superior to success (*abhyudaya*) and perfect isolation (*kaivalya*).

The Pāśupata aspirant who has attained the transcendent goal (*atigati*) by the transcendent means and thus is united with God (*Yukta*) outshines all the gods beginning with Brahman. Then, it is needless to say that he outshines those who are released (*mukta*) according to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga. While commenting on PS. 5. 40 Kauṇḍinya gives a remark as follows:

āha—atha sāṃkhya-yoga-muktāḥ kiṃ na viśeṣitāḥ? | ucyate-viśeṣitāḥ | katham? tad-jñānātiśayāt | katham? | sāṃkhya-yoga-muktāḥ kaivalya-gatāḥ svātma-parātma-jñāna-rahitāḥ saṃmūrcchitavat sthitāḥ | asya tu jñānam asti[9] (p. 140, lines 10-13) |

" (Question) Are not those who are released according to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga outshone by him (Pāśupata aspirant who is united)?

(Answer) They are.

(Question) How?

(Answer) Because he excels them in knowledge.

(Question) How so?

(Answer) Those who are released according to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga and who have attained isolation (*kaivalya*) lack knowledge of themselves or of anyone else, and remain like persons in a swoon. He (the Pāśupata *yukta*), on the contrary, has knowledge."

Even in the state of being released and united with God the Pāśupata aspirant has knowledge. In contrast to him, those who are released according to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga are here mocked at as those who are in a swoon (*saṃmūrcchitavat*).

Thus, those who consider themselves as having attained the goal and as being released according to the means taught in the Sāṃkhya and Yoga are

9. Pāśupata released soul is furnished with knowledge even at the time of being united with God. Cf. PS. 5. 37-38 (*saṃcittaṃ sthāpayitvā ca rudre*), and PS. 5, 40 (*apramādī gacched duḥkhānām antam īśa-prasādāt*).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

misled. In the *avataraṇa* and commentary on PS. 5. 8, Kauṇḍinya manifestedly looks down upon the Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

āha-anyatra sāṃkhya-yogādīnām asaṅgādi-yuktāḥ muktāḥ śāntim prāptāḥ | nirabhilapyā muktā ity ucyante yukta eva na mukta[10] *iti kva siddham ?*

tad ucyate-iha yasmād āha

RUDRAḤ PROVĀCA TĀVAT (5. 8)

....evaṃ yat sāṃkhyaṃ yogaś ca varṇayati asaṅgādi-yuktāḥ muktāḥ śāntim prāptā iti, tad aviśuddhaṃ teṣāṃ darśanam taimirikasya cakṣuṣaś candra-darśanam | ayaṃ tu yukta eva na mukta iti viśuddham etad darśanaṃ draṣṭavyam (p. 115, lines 4-13) |

"(Question) Elsewhere, in the teachings of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga, etc., (it is claimed that) those who are united with (or disciplined by) non-attachment, etc., are released and attain peace. By "released" they mean faultless. How is it established that (they are wrong and that) such (a man) is united (or disciplined) only and is not released?

(Answer) (It is established) here (in our scripture). For the scripture says:

(BECAUSE) RUDRA PROCLAIMED JUST THIS (5.8)

.....Now, regarding the term' *Proclaimed:* what the Sāṃkhya and Yoga thus say, namely, that those who are united with (or disciplined by) non-attachment, etc., are released and attain peace, this is a false view on their part. It is like the seeing of (two) moons by a man with an astigmatism. The correct view is that he (who is united) is simply united and is not (yet) released.

Here we see that the views of Sāṃkhya and Yoga are criticised as false as *taimirika*.

Thus, those who are released according to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga are not exactly the released souls in the Pāśupata sense of the term. In discussing the category of cattle (*paśu*), that is the soul to be released by the grace of the Lord (*paśu-pati*)", Kauṇḍinya quotes a verse which reads as follows :

sāṃkhya-yogena ye muktāḥ sāṃkhya-yogeśvarāś ca[12] *ye brahmādayas tiryag-antāḥ*[13], *sarve te paśavaḥ smṛtāḥ* (p. 5, lines 15-16) . |

---

10. Read *Yukta eva na mukta* for *mukta eva na yukta* on p. 115, line 5.

11. Cf. RT. p. 11, lines 1-5.
paśutva-sambandhī paśuḥ | *so 'pi dvi-vidhaḥ, sāñjano nirañjanas ceti* |
....nirañjanas tu tri-vidhaḥ, saṃhṛtaḥ kaivalya-gato
niṣṭhā-yoga-yuktaś ceti |

12. The word *yogeśvara* appears also in Kauṇḍinya p. 73, line 8,
tathā yogeśvarāḥ deveṣv antarbhūtāḥ |

13. *brahmādayas tiryag-antāḥ* means the fourteen places to be reborn (*sthāna*). These are specified by Kauṇḍinya on PS. 2.23
sthānāni tu brahmendra-deva-pitrādi-vacanād brāhmaṃ prājāpatyam
saumyam aindraṃ gāndharvaṃ yākṣaṃ, rākṣasam paiśākcam | iti tathā
brāhmaṇa-śūdra-go-mṛga-sarīsṛpa-bhūta-kṛtānrādi-vacarāt tathā
mānuṣa-paśu-mṛga-pakṣi-sarīsṛpa-sthāvarādīnāṃ grahaṇam (p. 73, lines 5-8). |
These fourteen places are referred to in both Gaudapada and *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 53. Cf. also *Liṅga Purāṇa* 1. 88. 70-72 (*caturdaśānām.....sthānānām....*).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

"Those who have won the release through Sāṃkhya and Yoga, the gods of Sāṃkhya and Yoga, indeed all creatures from brahman down to the animals are called "cattle" in the (true) tradition."

Thus, it is clearly stated that the Sāṃkhya and Yoga *muktas* remain as the souls still to be released and consequently not the released souls.

Towards the end of his commentary Kauṇḍinya mentions the Pāśupata methods of explanation, *samāsa, vistara, vibhāga, viśeṣa, upasaṃhāra* and *nigamana*. Of these the fourth method, *viśeṣa* (distinction) is to state the superiority of the Pāśupata system over others with respect to the five categories peculiar to the Pāśupata Śaivism. We shall quote these passages under the heading of *pati, paśu* and *yoga*.

(*a*) *Pati-viśeṣaḥ-anyeṣāṃ pradhānādīni, asmākaṃ tad-vyatirikto bhagavān īśvaraḥ* (p. 147, lines 9-10).

"Now the method of distinction. Primordial matter is called the cause (in Sāṃkhya) and other (entities are called the cause) in other scriptures; but in our system the Blessed One, the ruler, who is different from primordial matter, etc., (is the cause)."

(*b*) *Paśu-viśeṣaḥ-anyeṣāṃ pradhānādīni kāraṇāni tānīha śāstre kāryatvena vyākhyātāni|tatra pradhānaṃ kāraṇam anyeṣāṃ, tad iha śāstre*[14] *paśyanāt pāśakatvāt kāryatvena vyākhyātam|tathā puruṣaḥ kāraṇam anyatra, iha śāstre paśutvāt kāryatvena vyākhyātaḥ* (p. 147, line 21-p. 148, line 2)

"The method of distinction: in other systems primordial matter, etc. is called the cause; but in our scripture it is explained as being the effect. In other system (the cattle are assigned to the category cause), but in our scripture they are explained as belonging to the category effect because they perceive and because they are bound. In other systems *puruṣa* (spirit, individual soul) is the cause; but in our scripture it is explained as belonging to the class cattle and therefore to the category of effect."

(*c*) [15]*yoga-viśeṣaḥ-anyeṣāṃ kaivalyam, iha tu viśeṣo vikaraṇam iti* (p. 148 lines 14-15).

"Now the method of distinction. In other systems the final goal is perfect isolation (*kaivalya*), but here the final goal is better, namely, freedom from the instruments."[16]

As is seen from the above passages, the schools from which Kauṇḍinya tries to distinguish his own are Sāṃkhya and Yoga. The ultimate principle

---

14. For this Volksetymologie of *paśu* (*paśyanāt pāśakatvāt*), Cf. Kauṇḍinya on PS. 1 1 (p. 5, lines 5 ff.)

15. Cf. RT. p. 14, line 28 - p. 15, line 3,
Śāstrāntarokta-padārthebhyo[2] *'mīṣām atiśayābhidhānam viśeṣaḥ*
....tathānyatra kaivalyābhyudaya-phalo yogaḥ, iha tu parama-duḥkhānta-phalaḥ
"Distinction is the showing of the superiorities of our categories to those of other scriptures. In other system *yoga* brings about the state of perfect isolation and success (*kaivalya-abhyudaya*), but here it brings about the complete end of suffering."

16. Cf. PS. 1.25.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

(*puruṣa* or *pradhāna*) and the highest goal (*kaivalya*) of Sāṃkhya and Yoga are here assigned by Kauṇḍinya to a position of secondary importance. Here, we notice the monotheistic flavour of the Pāśupata doctrine according to which the God Śiva himself assumes the highest position.

From those passages as discussed above we can make the following conclusions. Pāśupata doctrine excels Sāṁkhya and Yoga in both the means (*sādhana*) and the goal (*sādhya*), the means being *atidāna* (trenscendent giving), etc. and the goal being *atigati* (transcendent goal) which is superior to *abhyudaya* of Sāṃkhya and *kaivalya* of Yoga. The *muktas* (released souls) of Sāṃkhya and Yoga are not yet released and are included in the category of *paśu*. They are even looked down upon like persons in a swoon, lacking knowledge of themselves or of anyone else. The followers of Sāṃkhya and Yoga are condemned as holding false views as *taimirika*.

III

As has been discussed in the previous section, the perfect isolation (*kaivalya*), which is the highest ideal of Sāṃkhya and Yoga[17], is not the goal to which the Pāśupata aspirant strives to attain. Now in the following, we shall enumerate the contexts in which the word *kaivalya* occurs and shall ascertain the position allotted to this central conception of Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

The duty of an aspirant who aims at the end of suffering (*duḥkhānta*) is simply to serve his teacher. His objective being the *duḥkhānta*, he does not care for the ordinary purposes.

.....*duḥkhāntārthinaḥ śiṣyasyehopasadana-pravṛttiḥ* | *na tu dharmārthakāma-kaivalyārthātreti* (p. 3, lines 11-12).

"And the activity of a pupil, whose purpose is to end his suffering, is here (in this system) to attend upon his teacher. On the other hand (in this system the pupil's activity is) not for the purpose of merit, wealth, sensual gratification or perfect isolation (as it is in other systems)."

This inclusion of *kaivalya* into profane objectives as *artha*, *kāma*, etc., is also found in Kauṇḍinya and PS. 5. 42 (*īśānaḥ sarva-vidyānām*).

Vidyānāṃ dharmārtha-kāma-kaivalya-tat-sādhana-parāṇām īśānaḥ (p. 144, lines 15-16).

"He is the Lord of knowledge in such forms as those which envisage the means to merit, wealth, sensual gratification and perfect isolation."

Thus, *kaivalya* is not the ultimate aim of the Pāśupata aspirant. Rather, God Śiva himself presides over those ordinary ideals. According to what Kauṇḍinya expressly states, God himself proclaims the Pāśupata ideal as different from *kaivalya*.

---

17. Cf. *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 68,
prāpte śarīrabhede caritārthatvāt pradhāna-vinivṛttau |
aikāntikam atyantikam ubhayam kaivalyam apnoti ||

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

"aparijñānān nāsmākaṃ yoga-niṣṭhaṃ tantram | api tu tat-kaivalya-vyatirikto 'pi sarvajñenocyate (p. 141, lines 2-3)[18]

"Our treatise is not founded on Yoga, because Yoga suffers from lack of complete knowledge. And its (aim) has been stated by an Omniscient (teacher) to be other than the perfect isolation (of the Yoga)."

Now, we shall quote two passages from Kauṇḍinya's commentary and Bhāsarvajña's R(atna)Ṭ(īkā), in which the compound *kaivalya-gata* occurs : *kaivalya-gatānām api duḥkhitva-darśanāt.....sarvācārya-viśiṣṭo 'yam ācārya iti* (p. 2, line 20-p. 3, line 3)

"The (Pāśupata) teacher here is distinguished above all the other teachers because we see that even those who attain the perfect isolation are subject to suffering."

Here we see that *kaivalya-gata* is excluded by Kauṇḍinya from a list of qualifications of the Pāśupata teacher[19]. A similar treatment of *kaivalya-gata* is also met in the RT. While discussing five impurities (*mala*) to be avoided and commenting upon the fifth impurity, *paśutva*, Bhāsarvajña says as follows:

tac cetiham-bhūtaṃ paśutvaṃ saṃsārasyānādi-kāraṇam pradhāna-bhūtam ity evam matvāha mūlam iti | tathā hi kaivalya-gatānāṃ anya-malābhāve' pi paśutvād eva punaḥ saṃsārāpattir iti (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 15, p. 23, lines 5-7)

"This inclusion in the category of cattle (*paśu*) is the eternal and chief cause of transmigration. Realizing this, the author terms it BASIS (*mūla*). For even those who have attained perfect isolation, though they may lack the other impurities, from the fact of their being cattle, will fall back into the world of transmigration."

Those *kaivalya-gata* are included in the category of *paśu* and still remain in the mundane cycle of transmigration.

On the basis of this textual evidence, we are assured to conclude as follows:

Kaivalya, the highest ideal of Sāṃkhya and Yoga, is not the goal of the Pāśupata aspirant. The Pāśupata ideal, the end of suffering (*duḥkhānta*). goes beyond that *kaivalya-vyatirikta* and *kaivalya* is classified by Kauṇḍinya into the ordinary ideal together with *artha*, *kāma*, etc., over which God Śiva Himself presides. The attainment of *kaivalya* is not a sufficient qualification of a Pāśupata teacher and those who have attained *kaivalya* (*kaivalya-gata*) still

18. The text is clearly corrupt. I have translated as if p. 141, lines 2-3 read *api tu tad-antaḥ kaivalyavyatirikta iti sarvajñenocyate.*

19. *Cf.* RT. p. 22, lines 12-14.

śāstrāntarebhyo' pi tarhi saṃśayādi-nivṛtter aviśeṣa-prasaṅga iti cen na' śāstrāntara-praṇetṛṇām api viparyayānivṛtti-pratipādanād ācārya-vaiśeṣya-prakaraṇe

"But it may be objected that even from other scriptures doubt may be dispelled and that there is therefore no particular advantage (in the Pāśupata system). This objection does not hold, for it has been shown under the topic of the superiority of the (Pāśupata) teacher that the authors of other scriptures do not dispel error."

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

remain in the mundane cycle of transmigration. Here we see that the ultimate ideal of Sāṃkhya and Yoga is allotted to a position of secondary importance and in place of this, God is assigned the highest position.

It is described in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* that *buddhi*, whose function is the ascertainment (*adhyavasāya*), has eight aspects; merit (*dharma*), knowledge (*jñāna*), dispassion (*vairāgya*), sovereignty (*aiśvarya*), demerit (*adharma*) ignorance (*ajñāna*), lack of dispassion (*avairāgya*), and lack of sovereignty (*anaiśvarya*); the first four being its *sāttvika* aspect and the last four its *tāmasa* aspect[20]. Of these, seven without knowledge are said to be a bondage by which *prakṛti* binds herself, and knowledge leads *puruṣa* to the release[21]. When *prakṛti* ceases from productive activity, the seven stop their function and *puruṣa* remains by himself, looking at *prakṛti* as a spectator[22]. Right knowledge come up and the seven cease their function[23].

These eight technical terms of *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* present themselves also in Kauṇḍinya's commentary. However, the treatment is somewhat different from that which is given in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* and they are dealt with as a group with no distinction of *jñāna* from the remaining seven. Below, we shall enumerate the contexts in which those eight terms appear and ascertain their location in Kauṇḍinya's commentary.

While discussing *duḥkhānta*, the final ideal of the Pāśupata doctrine, Kauṇḍinya says as follows.

tasmāt prasādāt sa duḥkhāntaḥ prāpyate | na tu jñāna-vairāgya-dharmaiśvarya-tyāga-mātrād ity arthaḥ (p. 6, lines 1-2)

"From this grace (of God) the end of suffering is attained and not from mere knowedge, dispassion, merit, sovereignty or their opposites. This is the meaning."

Here *prasāda* is of the primary importance and outshines the concepts peculiar to the Sāṃkhya Philosophy. A similar theistic flavour, according to which God has priority to the philosophical ideas, is met in Kauṇḍinya's etymological explanation of the word *bhava*.

bhavana-bhāvana-kṛtatvāt | yasmād deva-manuṣya-tiryaktvena (bhavati) bhāvayati ca tān īśvaraḥ | dharma-jñāna-vairāgyaiśvaryādharmājñānāvairāgyānaiśvaryāṇāṃ bhavana-bhāvanatvād bhavaḥ (p. 53, lines 7-9)

---

20. *Cf. Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 23,
adhyavasāyo buddhir dharmo jñānam virāga aiśvaryam
sāttvikam etad rūpaṃ tāmasam asmād viparyastam

21. *Cf. Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 63,
rūpaiḥ saptabhir eva tu badhnāty ātmānam ātmanā prakṛtiḥ
saiva ca puruṣārtham prati vimocayaty eka-rūpeṇa

22. *Cf. Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 65,
tena nivṛtta-prasavām artha-vaśāt sapta-rūpa-vinivṛttām
prakṛtiṃ paśyati puruṣaḥ prekṣakavad avasthitaḥ susthaḥ

23. *Cf. Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 67,
samyag-jñānādhigamād dharmādīnām akāraṇa-prāptau
tiṣṭhati saṃskāra-vaśāc cakra-bhrama iva dhṛta-śarīraḥ

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

"Because they are created by a process of becoming (*bhavana*) and of causing to become (*bhāvana*). (Each cattle) becomes a god, human or animal, and the Lord causes them so to become. (Again, the word) "birth" (*bhava*) is used because merit, knowledge, dispassion, sovereignty, demerit, ignorance, lack of dispassion, and lack of sovereignty are entities which become and which the Lord causes to become."

God presides over these eight factors even in the interval between cosmic creations. In the *avataraṇa* to PS. 2. 25, Kauṇḍinya gives the following remark in the form of question and answer:

'*āha—kālana-vikaraṇatvād*[24] *avāntara-sṛṣṭyāṃ karma-kṣaye vṛtti-lābhe cāpekṣate neti? | dharma-jñāna-vairāgyaiśvaryādīnāṃ vā kim eṣa bhagavān prabhur bhavati neti? | ucayate—prabhuḥ* (p. 74, lines 15-17).

"(Question) In the interval between cosmic creations does God stand in need of another mover and transformer for the destruction of karma and the attainment of activities? That is, is the Lord a master of merit, knowledge, dispassion, sovereignty, etc.?

(Answer) He is a master of them."

These eight entities are called *bala* together with *icchā*, *dveṣa*, *prayatna*, etc. by Kauṇḍinya and God Śiva obstructs these powers (*bala-pramathana*, PS. 2. 25).

God's power is not limited to obtstructing them, but also extended to transforming them. In his commentary on *kala-vikaraṇa*, another epithet of God, Kauṇḍinya says as follows :

vikaraṇatvaṃ nāma sthāna-śarīrendriya-viṣayādi-sanniveśena
vistara-vibhāgaviśeṣatas ca kārya-karaṇākhyābhiḥ kalābhir
dharma-jñāna-viarāgyaiśvaryādharmājñānāvairāgyānaiśvaryādibhiś ca
kṣetrajña-samyojanam ity etad bhagavati abhyadhi-katvaṃ śeṣeṣu ca
puruṣeṣu nyūnatvaṃ jñātvā yuktaṃ vaktuṃ kala-vikaraṇāya namaḥ
(p. 74, lines 9-12).

"His being able to transform the material componets means that he has the ability to join the individual souls to the material components which are called effect and instrument and to join them to merit, knowledge, dispassion, sovereignty, demerit, ignorance, lack of dispassion, lack of sovereignty, etc., through a process of distributing the souls to (their respectve) places (of birth), bodies, bodily organs, and their objects, etc., and this ability is exerted in a general way, an analytical way and a specific way. Thus, in view of the superiority of the Lord and inferiority of other individual souls, it is rightly said, homage to Him who transforms the material components."

Throughout these passages discussed above, we could notice that the eight modes of *buddhi*, that is, *dharma*, *jñāna*, *vairāgya*, *aiśvarya*, *adharma*, *ajñāna*, *avairāgya* and *anaiśvarya*, which are originally taught in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*,

24. The text is corrupt. I have translated as if p. 74, line 15 read *kālana-vikaraṇānyad* for *kālana-vikaraṇatvād*.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

appear here in Kauṇḍinya's commentary with no discrimination of *sāttvika* and *tāmasa* aspects, and there is no reference to *jñāna* as distinct from and superior to the other remaining seven as is taught in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 63, 65 and 67. They are treated here as a group of eight with no discriminatin among them. Furthermore, along with an introduction of the monotheistic element which characterises the Pāśupata Śaivism these eight items are unanimously discussed in contexts with the Supreme Lord. There we see that the Lord always stands above these eight and they are allotted only to an inferior rank to Him. Even the final ideal of Pāśupata, *duḥkhānta*, is attained not by *dharma*, *jñāna* and so forth, but simply by the grace of God (*prasāda*).

Although not specified as Sāṃkhya and Yoga, the following two passages seem to refer to those schools of thought.

In giving a definition to *harṣa* (PS. 2.12 : *harṣāpramādī*), Kauṇḍinya says as follows,

ity evaṃ yad anyeṣām aṇimādy-aṣṭa-guṇaṃ catuṣ-ṣaṣṭi-vikalpaṃ dharmakāryam aiśvaryaṃ tad iha śāstre harṣa iti samjñitam (p. 65, lines 18-19)

"Thus, what in other systems are called the eight qualities, beginning with infinite smallness and sovereignty derived from merit in its sixty four varieties are all termed "delights" in this scripture."

Obviously those eight qualities : *aṇiman*, *laghiman*, *mahiman* (cf. p. 65, lines 12-13) *prāpti*, *prākāmya*, *īśitva*, *vaśitva* and *yatra-kāmāvasāyitva* (cf. p. 65, lines 16-17) are those which are enumerated by Vyāsa on *Yoga Sūtra* 3.45 (*tato' ṇimādi-prādurbhāvaḥ kāya-sampattad-dharmānabhighātaṣ ca*), and Gauḍapāda and *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* 23. Here in the Pāśupata literature, however, the aspirants are warned not to indulge in these supernatural qualities (*harṣāpramādī*)[25].

Again, Bhāsarvajña seems to refer to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga, when he comments upon five impurities (*mala*), which are mentioned in the *Gaṇa Kārikā* 8,

ete eva saṃsāra-bandhātmakā malā na tu śāstrāntaroktā bhoktṛ-bhogya-sambandhādaya ity arthaḥ (p. 23, lines 8-9)

"That is to say, these (five) only are impurities which bind one to transmigration, not such other forces as the relation enjoyer-enjoyed, etc., which are mentioned in other scriptures."

Thus, even in the classification of impurities to be abandoned the Pāśupata seems to distinguish themselves from other scriptures which might have been those of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

IV

Those passages as discussed above lead us to the following conclusions: There are several elements in which the followers of Pāśupata Śaivism tried to distinguish themselves from those of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga. The schools of thought which were the main object of criticism of the Pāśupata writers, and against which they claimed their superiority are those of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga. In spite of closeness which the Pāśupata Śaivism held with Sāṃkhya

25. Cf. also Kauṇḍinya on PS. 2. 12 (p. 65, lines 19-20)
teṣu madam akurvan harṣāpramādī bhavati

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and Yoga as often referred to by classical writers, they are different from one another amongst themselves. Pāśupata always looked down upon Sāṃkhya-Yoga, and the monotheistic element which is essential to the former prevails over the philosophical concepts peculiar to the latter. This antagonism which the Pāśupata Śaivism held mainly against Sāṃkhya seems to be best illustrated by an inscription at Baḷagāmi, dated A.D. 1035. In the inscription which registers grants that were made over to Lakulīśvarapaṇḍitadeva, a Pāśupata ascetic of great note, we read a following passage :

.....lokāyata-mahā-taru-vidāraṇa-krakachaṃ sāṃkhyāhīndra-rumdra(?)vainateyaṃ advaitavādi-bhūja-kuṭhāram akalaṃka-tripura-dahanatriṇetram.....

" (to the holy Lakulīśvarapaṇḍita)....who is a saw to cleave asunder the great trees that are the Lokāyatas; he who is a great Vainateya (Garuḍa) to the large serpent that is the Sāṃkhya doctrine ; he who is an axe to the trees that are those who propound the Advaita philosophy ; he who is a very Trinetra (Śiva) to burn the three cities in the shape of Akalaṅka..."[26]

26. J. F. Fleet, "Inscriptions at Ablur," *Epigraphia Indica* 5, 1899, p. 227.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy